



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of this request had nothing else in view than to see the holy supper of the Lord administered according to the command of Jesus Christ, and according to the custom of the Church for many ages. But, notwithstanding that, these very reverend fathers were most obstinate in their refusal. Do you know why? Because Rome had approved of communion under one kind only, and they wished to make it appear that that Church was infallible.

Eustachio.—This seems impossible; but at all events the Council of Trent must have decreed something concerning the marriage of the clergy. It must, at least, have given some satisfaction to those who demanded that they should be left at liberty to marry or not as they pleased.

Salviano.—In the 24th Sess. (which was the eighth under Pius IV.), in the 9th canon, the fathers of the Council of Trent thus decreed—"If any one shall say that clerks constituted in sacred orders or regulars who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that, being contracted, it is valid, the ecclesiastical law or vow notwithstanding, &c., let him be anathema." Among the canons which were made in that same session, there is one which excommunicates all those who shall say that the Church has not power to dispense with the impediments of contracting marriage in some of the prohibited degrees (Can. 3). Now what is this Church except it be the pope, who permits a man to marry his sister-in-law? Is it the church? No; the Church has the name of this power, but the pope possesses it in fact. Pius IV., who was the last ruler of the council, and author of these canons, gave Philip II. permission to marry his own sister. St. John the Baptist said to Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (St. Matthew, xiv. 4.); but if that incestuous union was condemned by St. John, I suppose it might, for all that, by a particular dispensation, be allowed by the pope, for what is the Baptist himself when compared with his Holiness? A Roman council, moreover (celebrated under Gregory III.), thunders forth its interdicts, in the 5th canon, against the incestuous. It says—"If any one shall take in marriage his brother's wife, let him be anathema;" and all the fathers cried out three times "let him be anathema." But the Council of Trent (Sess. 24th, Canon 12), by adjudging every marriage case to the clergy, takes away the impediment—"If any one shall say that matrimonial causes do not concern ecclesiastical judges, let him be anathema." We must be very blind, if we do not see that this is a hurt to society and to secular government. In ancient times the sovereigns made the laws about matrimony, and St. Augustine (de civit. Dei lib., 15, cap. 16), and St. Ambrose (epist. 66), are our witnesses that Theodosius Cæsar was one of those who did so.

(To be Continued)

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY—No. III.

(Continued from page 35.)

The exertions of the Church of Rome to strengthen her system of discipline, by the prohibition of marriage among the clergy, at the close of the eleventh and commencement of the twelfth centuries, are matters with which students of church history are familiar. Less generally known to them, perhaps, is the (however, not less certain) fact, that the first propagation in Ireland of the influence in support of which such efforts were made, was owing to the settlement of the Danish invaders in the country; one of whom, Gille, educated at the Norman abbey of Bec, and afterwards bishop of the Danes of Limerick, brought over with him, from France, those predilections for the whole system of the Church of Rome which he had there imbibed; and his activity and zeal being such as to gain him, in the course of time, the appointment of *first Pope's legate for Ireland*, his exertions in that capacity appear to have been the instrument, more than any other, of securing for the principle and system of Papal supremacy a firm foundation in this island.

Kellach, or Kelly (called also Celsus), successor of St. Patrick, whose name occurs at A.D. 1105, &c., above, was an earnest adopter of the views propagated by Gille, as was in a still higher degree the famous Malachy, or Melmogue, whom he nominated as his successor to the primacy: this act, although not a very canonical one, indicating sufficiently Kellach's adoption of the new system, which led him thus to exert himself, in defiance of all rights claimed by other members of his family, to alienate from them the succession to the primacy, to which their hereditary title had been through many generations so firmly established. But his efforts to break this national custom could not be expected to be let pass without violent opposition.

Malachy, on his way to Rome, in A.D. 1139, and again when returning to Ireland on that occasion, and once more, just before his death, in A.D. 1148, paid three successive visits to the great St. Bernard, at Clairvaux, which gave the latter an opportunity of inquiring with great interest into the state of the Irish Church, and learning from his visitor much concerning her circumstances that was curious and worthy of note, especially to one educated under so different a system as that under which Bernard had been brought up. Among other things, Malachy gave him a particular account of the hereditary succession which had so long been regulating the appointments to the primacy in Ireland, and of the efforts at length made to break it,

in which he was himself so much interested. But in giving this recital Malachy seems to have confined his information to the case of Armagh, either not mentioning at all that this mode of succession was common and generally prevalent in Ireland, or else, perhaps, describing it as carried out in Armagh in an exclusive way, which led to abuses not so much to be observed elsewhere. This appears from the circumstance that St. Bernard, in his *Life of Malachy*, attacks with much fury the Armagh family succession, but makes no allusion to the operation of the same system in other places in Ireland. With regard to the former, his observations are to the following effect:—

"A most atrocious practice had been established, by the diabolical ambition of certain people of noble rank, that the holy see [i.e., of Armagh] should be obtained by hereditary succession; for they would allow none to be bishops there save such as were of their own tribe and family. Nor was it for any short period that this execrable succession had been going on; some fifteen generations having already been exhausted in such villainy. And so firmly had this wicked and adulterous generation established their unholy right (or wrong, rather, deserving to be punished by the worst death), that although there were at times no clergymen to be found of their blood, yet bishops they never were without. In fine, there had already been before Celsus, eight persons, who were married and without orders, yet still men of education. Hence arose throughout Ireland all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion aforesaid."

Celsus, therefore (or Kellach), anxious, according to St. Bernard, to remedy these evils, nominated Malachy for his successor; who, however, did not immediately nor easily obtain the office. "For, lo, of the wicked race, another, named Murtoth, seizes on the post, who for five years, by the aid of the secular power, settled himself on the Church, not a bishop, but a tyrant." And his "presumption," Bernard says, maintained this condition of "ecclesiastical adultery" (a Church with two bishops appearing to him like a wife with two husbands) for three years (see A.D. 1129, 1132, above); after which Malachy secured in part the "successorship of Patrick," in spite of the "numbers, power, and ambition of that noble family who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God." He could only, however, act in the office *through the country*, being excluded from appearing in Armagh by the power of his adversary, Murtoth, so long as he survived.

Murtoth dying A.D. 1134, "one Niall" (Nigellus—i.e., blackish), says St. Bernard, "yea, a thorough black, seized upon the see. For Murtoth, while yet alive, had made provision to this effect, against his own soul, that, going out of the world to be damned, he might have for heir one in whom he could still persist in adding to his works of damnation; for this latter, too, was of that damned race, a kinsman of Murtoth's."

What a strange contrast between the Irish obit of Murtoth, as above given from the *Four Masters*, at A.D. 1134, and the obit of the same individual in St. Bernard's *Latin Life of Malachy*. According to one, "Murtoth, Successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant;" according to the other, "Murtoth—no bishop, but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer—went from this world to be damned, yet still to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!" Why this difference? It arises, simply, dear reader, from the different feelings of the parties telling the same story in their different ways—it being told, in the first case, by men who looked at the matter simply in an old Irish and national point of view; in the other case, by one who viewed it as a zealous member of the Church of Rome at then existing, and seeking to establish her influence in Ireland.

Our next paper will, we hope, throw some further light on the matter so far elucidated in the present one.

R. K.

HOW FAR THE REFORMATION IS AFFECTED BY THE CHARACTERS AND MOTIVES OF THE REFORMERS.

It has been usual with Roman Catholic controversialists, since the time of the Reformation, to attempt to throw discredit on the Reformation itself by vilifying the characters of the principal persons who were engaged in bringing it about. Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Cranmer, and Knox have been charged with almost every crime that has disgraced the most infamous of men; and the vocabulary of malignant abuse has been exhausted to supply epithets sufficiently vile for such pestilent disturbers of the established order of things. These charges, it is needless to tell any one who knows anything whatever about the subject, have been met and refuted, over and over again. The most irrefragable evidence has been adduced, not from friends of the reforming party, but from impartial historians, and even from *enemies*, showing that the charges in question are either pure inventions, or such gross misrepresentations of facts as to be destitute of any force as proofs. Yet these charges still continue to be brought forward. Like the giant in the fable, each successive overthrow only seems to lend them new life and vigour. Thus, in a recent Roman Catholic Catechism,*

which, it appears, enjoys an extensive circulation, the very first page that we open contains a choice selection of the old stories about Luther, by which it was attempted to drag him down to the level of the heretics, the magicians, and unnatural monsters who, it is admitted by Baronius and Bellarmine, found means to seat themselves, from time to time, in the chair of St. Peter. In this Catechism, we ourselves soon recognised all our old acquaintances—the stock stories which we had occasion, some time since, to track through many a dusty folio, until we left them overwhelmed, as we thought, by a weight of opposing evidence which no wise Romanist would now venture to resist. It was, therefore, not without some surprise that we found them all furnished up anew, and marshalled in imposing array, just as if they had never before been challenged and refuted. At first, we felt inclined to be somewhat provoked at this cool ignoring of all that had been said and written upon the subject; but, upon second thoughts, we saw reason to change our mind, and rather to rejoice that these ancient calumnies were again raked up and paraded with such affected triumph. In matters of every-day life, when two rival causes are submitted to our judgment it is usually regarded as a presumption in favour of one of them, when its opponents, instead of assailing it with legitimate arguments, endeavour to raise a prejudice against it by abusing its advocates, and blackening their characters; and we are, on the other hand, irresistibly led to suspect that there must be something radically unsound in the cause of those who indulge in such personalities, and seek to divert attention from the facts and reason of the case to discussions either entirely irrelevant, or, at least, of very secondary importance. We recognise, at once, the well-known tactics of unscrupulous advocates, and we conclude that a cause which needs such advocacy, must be inherently weak and bad. This, we think, is the result to which, in ordinary disputes, every impartial and sensible looker-on is inevitably led. And the presumption becomes a certainty, when it further appears that the individuals so attacked have already satisfactorily vindicated their characters from the aspersions cast upon them, and that the charges, so pertinaciously insisted on, are nothing better than exploded calumnies. Unfair dealing of this kind, at all times reprehensible and offensive, becomes doubly so in matters of religion. Every right-minded man feels instinctively that the sacredness of the subject ought to protect it from the pollution of such base and dishonourable devices. And yet, unfortunately, it is too true that the proverbial bitterness of religious strife has nowhere more frequently displayed itself than in this very mode of procedure. When the doctrines of the Reformation proved too stubborn to be refuted by argument, the characters of the Reformers were assailed by every vile calumny which the malignity of defeated controversialists and the wrath of an offended hierarchy, conscious that their system had received a fatal wound, could devise. These accusations were, as we have said before, met and answered as soon as they were made. But they form too inviting a topic for popular declamation to be given up merely because they are groundless. Accordingly, Mr. Keenan and other controversialists of the same stamp gloat over them with manifest delight, and retail them for the benefit of those who are ignorant enough to believe that they are all unquestioned facts.

Nor is this the only unfairness of which inquiring Roman Catholics, no less than Protestants, have to complain in this matter. A moment's reflection will show that besides the suspicious charges which are sought to be palmed upon the ignorant as established facts, there is also a gross fallacy at the bottom of the argument deduced from them. The argument is the following:—The Reformers were bad men; therefore the Reformation must be a bad thing, and its doctrines must be false. No reasonable man requires to be told that this conclusion is not necessarily true, even admitting the assumed fact that the authors of the Reformation were worthless men, influenced by selfish and bad motives. Let us just apply the same argument to one or two other cases in which party bias does not interfere to warp our judgments. The Barons of England, in the time of King John, were licentious, lawless, and selfish men; therefore, *Magna Charta* is worthless. The Crusaders were, for the most part, greedy and unprincipled adventurers; therefore, the religion of which they were the champions—viz., Christianity—is false; and the faith against which they fought—viz., Mahometanism—is true. Every one, including, probably, Mr. Keenan himself, would at once exclaim that this reasoning is invalid. And yet, the argument of Roman Catholics against the Reformation and in favour of their own system, from the supposed bad characters of the promoters of the former, is, in principle, not one whit more sound.

We might let the matter rest here, as even the general answer just given is abundantly sufficient for the vindication both of the Reformers and the Reformation. We are not, however, disposed to stop at this point, but we shall proceed to examine the question more in detail; and we undertake to show not only that the assumed facts are false, and that the argument founded upon them is nugatory; but that, if it be admitted to be valid, it puts into Protestant hands a weapon which may be wielded with the most deadly effect against the very system which it was framed to uphold—viz., the system of the Papacy.

We have then two distinct assertions to deal with—first, that the principal Reformers were selfish, worthless, and wicked men; and, secondly, that the fact of their being

* "Controversial Catechism," by Rev. S. Keenan. Edinb., 1851.